

3. (Amended) The process as claimed in claim 1, wherein it ~~furthermore~~ comprises a repeating of the steps of claim 1 are repeated until the first network locks onto a channel for which no collision is detected.

4. (Previously presented) The process as claimed in claim 1, wherein the change of channel request comprises an identifier of the first network.

5. (Previously presented) The process as claimed in claim 1, wherein the change of channel request comprises an identifier of the apparatus.

6. (Previously presented) The process as claimed in claim 1, wherein the request comprises a parameter indicating a transmission channel suggested to the first network.

7. (Amended) The process as claimed in claim 1, wherein the request comprises a parameter indicating the number of times that [this] the request has already been sent to the first network.

8. (Amended) The process as claimed in claim 1, wherein before association is made from the apparatus to the first network, the apparatus knows the identity of the central controller of the first network and in that the frames transmitted on the first network comprise a field identifying this the central controller.

9. (Amended) The process as claimed in claim 8, wherein the determination of the collision is carried out by detecting [the fact] that the apparatus cannot decode at least one of:

certain frames ~~or transmitted on the first network and~~ parts of frames transmitted on the first network.